

Serial No. 10/015,369

Page 2 of 4

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application.

The Examiner maintained, in the Advisory Action, that the claims cannot read on Fig. 2 because its corresponding description could only be found in the background section of the specification. Applicants point out, again, to the Examiner that the description in the specification only refers to Fig. 2 as an "assumed configuration" to illustrate improvements and problems identified by Applicants and solved by the claimed invention. Even the language highlighted by the Examiner, "it is difficult to connect in common phase the outputs of the two amplifiers 1 and 2 shown in Fig. 2 in the coupling unit 5," merely describes a difficulty recognized by Applicants themselves. Nowhere in this language is there any concession that any feature discussed or illustrated is prior art work of another.

The Examiner stated in the Advisory Action that "the improvement(s) do not start until figure 3...figure 4...[etc.]." Applicants respectfully point out that such figures merely illustrate exemplary embodiments of the invention. And as stated before, Fig. 2 merely illustrates an assumed configuration that illustrates the problems and improvements identified by the Applicants. Most importantly, Applicants have not conceded that the features illustrated in Fig. 2 reflect any techniques known or used by others prior to the Applicants' claimed invention. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention may encompass exemplary embodiments described in the specification so long as it is distinguishable from the prior art.

Applicants, once again, refer the Examiner to MPEP § 608.01(c), which states that the Background section of an application may include "the problems involved in the prior art or other information disclosed which are solved by the applicant's invention..." (Emphasis added)

84200677_1.DOC

Serial No. 10/015,369

Page 3 of 4

The recognition and description of such problems and "other information," which is "known to the applicant," included for illustrating problems solved by the claimed invention are not, themselves, admitted as prior art. And MPEP § 608.01(c) clearly provides for the inclusion of such "other information" distinct from admitted "prior art." Applicants also refer to MPEP § 2129, which requires an applicant's explicit statement identifying the *work of another* as "prior art" for all admissions of prior art. Indeed, MPEP § 2129 further states,

"even if labeled as 'prior art,' the work of the same inventive entity may not be considered prior art against the claims unless it falls under one of the statutory categories." (Emphasis in original)

Again, Applicants merely illustrate their own work in Fig. 2 on possible ways to improve existing techniques, and therefore, have not admitted such portions of the application as prior art work of another. Accordingly, Applicants, again, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to Fig. 2.

Applicants refer to the February 13, 2007 Response to Office Action for remarks addressing the remaining issues in the final Office Action dated October 18, 2006.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.


84200677_1.DOC

Serial No. 10/015,369

Page 4 of 4

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Dexter T. Chang
Reg. No. 44,071

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Telephone: (212) 940-6384

Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987

Docket No.: 100794-00105 (FUJH 19.249)

DTC:bf

84200677_1.DOC